

Editor's Commentary

What is the purpose of research inquiries as applied to aviation and aerospace? In some small way, each study we publish helps everyone on the planet get closer to our shared objective: to escape Earth and set up residence elsewhere before our Sun swallows us up in a spectacular supernova. So no matter how seemingly insignificant, studies with limited scope are necessary and vital. When editors easily dismiss the work of researchers, they unnecessarily slow our progress toward our objective. Peer reviews are valued and necessary, because they ensure the highest quality of research, if the reviewers resist too narrow a view of possibilities. It is good to disagree, but it is no sin to have either opposing view.

The editorial board embraces the six elements of Thomas Kuhn's structure of research: (1) normal science; (2) puzzle-solving; (3) paradigm; (4) anomaly; (5) crisis; and (6) revolution (in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions: 50th Anniversary Edition*, 2012). The articles in Volume 34, Issue 1 fit nicely within Kuhn's structure. Mehta and Rice studied the effect of system wide trust among U.S. and Indian passengers. Their study helps us understand the difference in paradigm between nationalities. Ison and Szathmari help us understand the nature of academic integrity, by describing and testing the plagiarism paradigm that underlies software snitching routines like SafeAssign. Morris' paper on the question of whether the NTSB statistics support current FAA third class medical policy challenges our reliance on a certificate to forecast possible connections between accidents and recency of certification. Finally, Swartz, Donovan, and Clower lend support to decision-makers on whether or not to maintain and improve general aviation airports, if economic indicators show a direct correlation between adequate facilities and corporate use of the airport.

I hope readers will enjoy this issue and will think about sending us their manuscripts as well.

TpH